



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/904,011 | 07/11/2001 | Avi Ashkenazi | 10466/45 | 1120 |
| 35489 | 7590 | 05/10/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP 275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD MENLO PARK, CO 94025-3506 | | | SAOUD, CHRISTINE J | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1647 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/904,011

Applicant(s)

ASHKENAZI ET AL.

Examiner

Christine J. Saoud

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 39-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 39-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 39-43 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-38 and 44 have been canceled and claim 39 has been amended as requested by Applicant in the amendment filed 03 March 2004.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Any objection or rejection of record which is not expressly repeated in this action has been overcome by Applicant's response and withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 03 March 2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Priority

Applicant asserts that U.S. Application No. 60/100,858, filed September 17, 1998 discloses stimulatory activity in MLR (mixed lymphocyte reaction) assay and that the assay tests the ability of a protein to stimulate T lymphocyte proliferation and is therefore useful for assessing the immune response of an individual (see page 9 of the response). However, a review of the instant application and this assay do not lead to a conclusion of utility based on this assay, and therefore, priority to this provision application is not afforded for the reasons to follow. The effective filing date of the

Art Unit: 1647

instant application is still based on the disclosure PCT/US00/04414, filed 2/22/2000 for the reasons of record.

Applicant asserts at page 9 of the response that Example 74, page 208 of the specification at line 27, supports utility of the claimed invention and therefore, priority back to the earliest provisional application should be afforded. Example 74 of the specification is stimulatory activity in a mixed lymphocyte reaction (MLR) assay. However, the ability of a protein to stimulate lymphocyte proliferation in this assay does not support a specific and substantial utility for the claimed invention. The ability to stimulate or inhibit lymphocyte proliferation in the MLR assay is an artificial *in vitro* system and does not provide for what specific conditions or for which specific diseases the claimed invention would predictably function. The assertion that the claimed invention could be useful for the treatment of conditions where the enhancement of the immune response would be beneficial (page 208, lines 29-30) is not specific since there are many such conditions, and it is not predictable of which conditions the claimed invention may function, if any.

Mixed lymphocyte culture (MLC) is a special case of antigen stimulation in which T lymphocytes respond to foreign histocompatibility antigen on unrelated lymphocytes or monocytes. MLC is a functional assay of cellular response to stimulatory determinants associated predominantly with HLA class II molecules. A single genetic locus or region, known as HLA, controls the MLC reactivity. The MLC assay recognizes disparate HLA class II molecules and the resulting T-cell activation, which is thought to represent an *in vitro* model of the afferent arm of the *in vivo* allograft reaction. The

Art Unit: 1647

degree of reactivity observed correlates with the degree of antigenic disparity between responding and stimulating cells. Briefly, when the lymphocytes of 2 HLA-disparate individuals are combined in tissue culture, the cells enlarge, synthesize DNA, and proliferate, whereas HLA-identical cells remain quiescent. Since both cells will normally proliferate, a one way test is used to monitor the response of a single responder cell by inactivating the stimulator cell by radiation or drugs in order to inhibit DNA synthesis of the stimulator cell. The proliferation is driven primarily by the differences in the class II HLA antigens between the 2 test cells (or individuals). This reaction is not predictive of general responses of the immune system because, *in vivo*, activation of a lymphocyte is controlled not only by antigen binding but also by interactions with other cells. All T cells must cooperate with antigen-presenting cells, whereas B cells and cytotoxic T cells depend on helper T lymphocytes. These interactions either require direct surface-to-surface contact or are mediated by cytokines that act only over extremely short distances. Because of this interdependence, lymphocyte activation occurs commonly and efficiently in the secondary lymphoid organs, where lymphocytes, antigens, and antigen-presenting cells encounter one another at close quarters. See pages 30-31, 208-209, 246-247 of "Basic and Clinical Immunology", 1994. See also, "Manual of Clinical Laboratory Immunology", 6th Edition at pages 1164-1166.

Kahan clearly states that no *in vitro* immune assay predicts or correlates with *in vivo* immunosuppressive efficacy; there is no surrogate immune parameter as a basis of immunosuppressive efficacy and/or for dose extrapolation from *in vitro* systems to *in vivo* conditions (Cur. Opin. Immunol. 4: 553-560, 1992; see entire document,

Art Unit: 1647

particularly page 558, column 2). Piccotti et al. (Transplantation 67: 1453-1460, 1999) demonstrate that IL-12 enhances alloantigen-specific immune function as determined by MLC, but this result *in vitro* does not result in a measurable response *in vivo* (i.e. failure to accelerate allograft rejection) (see page 1459). Campo et al. (Biological Trace Element Res. 79: 15-22, 2001) demonstrate that while zinc suppresses alloreactivity in MLC, it does not decrease T-cell proliferation *in vitro* nor produce immunosuppressive effects *in vivo*. Therefore, the MLC assay, which is art recognized for determining histocompatibility, does not appear to be predictive of general immune responses *in vivo*.

Additionally, difficulties arise in quantification when using MLC as a test for T cell function due to variations in stimulator cell antigens that determine the degree of genetic disparity between stimulator and responder cells. MLC is typically used for determining histocompatibility in an individual and as a test for immunocompetence of T cells in patients with immunodeficiency disorders. When running the MLC assay for determining histocompatibility for transplantation, autologous controls combining self with irradiated self are necessary to normalize the response of each cell to stimulators. Furthermore, there is known inherent variability of individual cellular responses from day to day which requires performing the entire familial MLC at one time in the case of determining histocompatibility for transplantation (page 246 in "Basic and Clinical Immunology"). When performing the MLC assay, each individual lot of a serum source should be screened for growth support capabilities and possible HLA antibodies (see page 1165 in "Manual of Clinical Laboratory Immunology"). Additionally, the screen

Art Unit: 1647

should include a control response to a pool of allogeneic cells to measure maximum response and an autologous control to ensure low backgrounds.

Therefore, the MLC (a.k.a. MLR) assay is a measure of alloreactivity of one individual to another individual, rather than a general measure of immune function. This reactivity is governed by the antigenic disparity between the two individuals which are being compared in the assay. Depending on the individuals being tested, the MLC may indicate stimulation if they are HLA-disparate or the MLC may indicate no stimulation if the individuals are HLA-identical. The ability of the claimed invention to stimulate proliferation in the MLC assay may not be a general stimulus to lymphocyte proliferation, but rather a reaction to one of the MHC antigens on the responder cell. The instant specification fails to provide sufficient detail of the assay which was performed and fails to provide any data whatsoever in order for one of ordinary skill in the art to evaluate the conclusion that lymphocyte proliferation was stimulated by the claimed invention. As pointed out above, there are several controls which the art recognizes as being essential for meaningful results for this assay, including autologous controls, a control to determine maximum response, screening for possible HLA antibodies and growth support capabilities. Furthermore, there is known inherent variability of individual cellular responses from day to day, which would clearly dictate the need for internal controls. The specification indicates that CD4-IgG was used as a control, but it is not clear how this would control for background stimulation or provide for a measure of maximal stimulation. Lastly, the specification fails to provide any data or evidence of the results of the assay, therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art cannot

Art Unit: 1647

evaluate the conclusion. The specification states that "positive increases over control are considered positive", however, this does not indicate that statistical significance must occur for determination of a positive result in the assay. In conclusion, the results of the MLC (a.k.a. MLR) assay do not support a specific and substantial utility for the claimed invention because the assay is not predictive of immune response in general, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not expect a stimulatory effect in the MLC assay to correlate to a general stimulatory effect on the immune system, absent evidence to the contrary.

Applicant asserts at page 9 of the response that the MLR assay is well-established. The Examiner does not dispute that the MLR assay is readily used in the art to which the invention pertains. Applicant further asserts that the assay is useful for assessing the immune response of an individual. However, a more appropriate interpretation, as supported by the above statements, is that the MLR assay assesses the immune response of an individual to allogens. However, this information still doesn't lend utility/use of the claimed invention for the reasons stated above.

Applicant asserts that the MLR assay is the best *in vitro* model for screening immunosuppressive agents for use in the prevention of graft-versus host disease and graft rejection (see page 10 of the response). However, the asserted utility in the specification is that the protein is a stimulatory molecule. The only indication of what the disclosed invention is to be useful for is for general increase of natural defenses, which is not a substantial utility at the time the instant application was filed. There is no teaching in the art or in the instant specification which would make this asserted utility

Art Unit: 1647

readily available to the skilled artisan, especially in light of the lack of predictability of the MLR assay for determining *in vivo* results (see above). The ability to increase an *in vitro* graft versus host response may or may not be reflective of an ability to stimulate an immune response *in vivo* (see above), therefore, it is not predictive and the disclosed results in the MLR assay do not support a specific, substantial and credible utility.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Based on the priority determination and the lack of utility for the claimed invention based on the results of the MLR assay, the art is applied accordingly. Applicant's arguments that the references are not art based on priority are not persuasive for the reasons above for denying priority.

Claims 39 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by HSIEH et al. (Nature 398:431-436, 1999) for the reasons of record.

Claims 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by BREWER et al. (WO 98/54963; published 10 December 1998) for the reasons of record.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1647

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine J. Saoud whose telephone number is 703-305-7519. The examiner can normally be reached on mttr, 8:00-2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on 703-308-4623. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

**CHRISTINE J. SAOUD
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Christine J. Saoud